



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,250	07/12/2006	Norihide Momose	4255-21	1891
23117 7590 08/29/2011 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
PEREN, VINCENT ROBERT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/29/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/551,250	Applicant(s) MOMOSE ET AL.	
	Examiner VINCENT PEREN	Art Unit 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) VINCENT PEREN. (3) John Eisenhart (Reg. No. 38,128).

(2) KING POON (SPE). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 August 2011.

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☐ 112 ☐ 102 ☒ 103 ☐ Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: MACHIDA ET AL. (US 2001/0279810).

Substance of Interview
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Applicant's representative, John Eisenhart (Reg. No. 38,128), presented a proposed amendment to overcome the 103A rejection in the last Office Action. After some discussion and refinement of the proposed amendment, it was agreed by all parties that the refined amendment would place the claims in condition for allowance in view of the prior art of record. However, as is always the case, Applicant's representative was reminded that the allowability of the claims is always subject to reconsideration in view of any newly discovered prior art that may subsequently come to light.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/Vincent Peren/ Examiner, Art Unit 2625	/KING POON/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625
--	---